

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 8-12 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-7 and 13-14 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (US Pat. 5,986,730) in view of Motomura et al. (US Pat. 6,724,446).

By the above amendment, applicant has canceled claims 8-10 without prejudice. In response to the rejection, applicant submits that claims 1-5 and 13-14 are allowable over Hansen et al in view of Motomura et al, as follows:

Amended claim 1 recites in part:

A liquid crystal display, comprising...a liquid crystal panel having a reflective polarizing element...and...a backlight module having...a quarter-wave plate...wherein the liquid crystal panel is located on the backlight module, and **the reflective polarizing element of the liquid crystal panel faces toward and is adjacent to the quarter-wave plate** of the backlight module.

Applicant submits that even if the combining of Hansen et al and Motomura et al is proper, amended claim 1 still has novel and unobvious physical features over the stated combination.

The combination may be considered to constitute a reflective polarizer (15)

which may be electrically conductive, or which may be coated with a transparent conductor, so that it may act as the second electrode (column 7, lines 46-48, in Hansen et al)...and wherein the polarization reorientation means (quarter-wave retardation plate) is disposed behind the third polarizer (23) (column 8, lines 22-23, in Hansen et al). However, the combination does not disclose or suggest the limitation whereby **“the reflective polarizing element of the liquid crystal panel faces toward and is adjacent to the quarter-wave plate of the backlight module,”** as recited in amended claim 1. That is, the combination does not disclose or suggest the order of arrangement of the elements in amended claim 1. Accordingly, the combination clearly fails to teach or suggest the liquid crystal display as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, applicant submits that the novel physical features of amended claim 1 produce new and unexpected results over any combination of Hansen et al and Motomura et al. Namely, the reflective polarizing element and the quarter-wave plate cooperatively utilize all the light emitted by the light source for illumination. The light energy is efficiently used, and the liquid crystal display has a higher brightness.

Thus applicant submits that amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 all depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claim 13 recites in part:

A method of making a liquid crystal display system, comprising steps of...**providing one reflective polarizing element on a rear portion of the liquid crystal panel and in front of the quarter-wave plate.**

Applicant submits that even if the combining of Hansen et al and Motomura et al is proper, claim 13 still has novel and unobvious physical features over the stated combination.

The combination may be considered to constitute a reflective polarizer (15) which may be electrically conductive, or which may be coated with a transparent conductor, so that it may act as the second electrode (column 7, lines 46-48, in Hansen et al)...and wherein the polarization reorientation means (quarter-wave retardation plate) is disposed behind the third polarizer (23) (column 8, lines 22-23, in Hansen et al). However, the combination does not disclose or suggest the limitation of "**providing one reflective polarizing element on a rear portion of the liquid crystal panel and in front of the quarter-wave plate,**" as recited in claim 13. That is, the combination does not disclose or suggest the order of arrangement of the elements in claim 13. Accordingly, the combination clearly fails to teach or suggest the method as recited in claim 13.

Moreover, applicant submits that the novel features of claim 13 produce new and unexpected results over any combination of Hansen et al and Motomura et al. Namely, the method yields a liquid crystal display that has a higher brightness.

Thus applicant submits that claim 13 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 13 are respectfully requested.

As regards claim 13, as asserted above, any combination of Hansen et al and Motomura et al does not disclose the structure yielded in claim 13. Accordingly, the light in such combination would not act in the same manner as that recited in claim 13. Further and in any event, claim 14 depends directly from claim 13. For these reasons, claim 14 should also be allowable.

Claims 6-7 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. and Motomura et al in view of Wang et al. (US Pat. 5,982,464).

By the above amendment, applicant has canceled claims 11-12 without prejudice. In response to the rejection, applicant submits that claims 6-7 are allowable over Hansen et al and Motomura et al in view of Wang et al, as follows:

Claims 6-7 depend from amended claim 1, which recites that **"the reflective polarizing element of the liquid crystal panel faces toward and is adjacent to the quarter-wave plate of the backlight module."**

For reasons similar to those asserted above in relation to amended claim 1, applicant submits that amended claim 6 should also be allowable.

Applicant refers to and relies on the above assertions regarding the patentability of amended claim 1 over Hansen et al and Motomura et al. As regards claim 6, applicant respectfully submits that Wang et al does not provide any additional teaching to the teachings of Hansen et al and Motomura et al which might lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the invention of amended claim 1. As regards claim 7, applicant respectfully submits that the remarks provided by Examiner do not provide any additional teaching to the teachings of

Hansen et al and Motomura et al which might lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the invention of amended claim 1. For these reasons, amended claim 1 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Hansen et al and Motomura et al in view of Wang et al. Claims 6-7 each depend directly from amended independent claim 1. Therefore claims 6-7 are patentable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 6-7 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Tai-Cheng Yu et al

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137